

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

OLAF SUTTON,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	NO. 11-7005
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**O R D E R**

**AND NOW**, this **20th** day of **May, 2014**, for the reasons stated in the accompanying memorandum opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

(1) Plaintiff's claims for injunctive or declaratory relief are **MOOT**;

(2) Aramark Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 59) is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part** as set forth below;

(a) Defendant's Motion is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's claims under the First Amendment and RLUIPA;

(b) Defendant's Motion is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's Equal Protection Clause claim against Flaherty in his official capacity;

(C) Defendant's Motion is **DENIED** as to Plaintiff's claims under the Equal Protection Clause as to

Aramark and Flaherty in his individual capacity;

(3) City of Philadelphia's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**;

(4) Counts III, IV, and V of the Amended Complaint are **DISMISSED**;

(5) Counts I, II, and VI may proceed to the extent they seek monetary damages under the Equal Protection Clause.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Eduardo C. Robreno  
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.